

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENTTED STATES DEPARIMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark, Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bec 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 WWW.Usploager

PPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 10/031,317 01/16/2002		LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
		01/16/2002	Tomohide Takeuchi	52433/675		
26646	7590	11/19/2003		EXAMINER		
KENYON ONE BROA		ON	MCHENRY, KEVIN L			
NEW YORK		0004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1725		

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Application No	A	pplicant(s)			
		10/031,317	TA	KEUCHI ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Ar	t Unit			
		Kevin L McHenr		25			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	ppears on the cove	r sheet with the corre	espondence address			
- Exter after - If the - If NO - Failur - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Issions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuted by the Office later than three months after the mailing displayment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	. 136(a). In no event, how ply within the statutory mind will expire to cause the application to the cause	ever, may a reply be timely fi nimum of thirty (30) days will SIX (6) MONTHS from the m	led be considered timely. ailing date of this communication.			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22	August 2003.					
2a)⊠							
3)□ Dispositio	Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under on of Claims	vance except for fo	rmal matters, prose	cution as to the merits is O.G. 213.			
4)⊠	Claim(s) $1-5$ is/are pending in the application						
4	a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consider	ation.				
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,2,4 and 5</u> is/are rejected.						
7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>3</u> is/are objected to.						
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election require	ment.				
9)□ T	he specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
	he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce		ed to by the Examine	ır			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
11)[] T	he proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)⊡ approve	d b)☐ disapproved	by the Examiner.			
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re						
12)[T	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.					
riority ur	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) 🔲 📝	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d)	or (f).			
	All b) Some * c) None of:	•		()			
,	Certified copies of the priority document	s have been recei	ved.				
2	Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	B. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Buse the attached detailed Office action for a list	rity documents ha reau (PCT Rule 1	ve been received in 7.2(a)).				
	knowledgment is made of a claim for domesti			a provinienal analication			
	The translation of the foreign language pro						
15)□ Ác	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	ic priority under 38	5 U.S.C. §§ 120 and	 ⁄or 121.			
ttachment(s			- 				
) 🔲 Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ution Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲	nterview Summary (PTO Notice of Informal Patent Other:	-413) Paper No(s) Application (PTO-152)			
Patent and Trad OL-326 (Rev	0.1.0.13	tion Summary		Part of Paper No. 111203			

Application/Control Number: 10/031,317

Art Unit: 1725

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 98/35775 in view of JP 4-342,468.

WO 98/35775 teaches a ceramic plate material for the side dams of a twin-drum strip caster. This reference teaches that the ceramic plate material can be made of various suitable ceramic materials, such as BN-Si₃N₄ (see WO 98/35775; particularly Figures 1, 2a-2c, 3; page 8).

WO 98/35775 does not teach a ceramic plate material with the combination of composition and properties claimed by the applicant.

JP 4-342,468 teaches a ceramic that is suitable for use in the continuous casting of carbon steel, stainless steel, and high alloy steel. JP 4-342,468 teaches that the ceramic has a composition of 5-70 wt% BN, 25-75 wt% Si₃N₄, and 3-35 wt% AlN. This reference also teaches that a spinel, such as MgO · Al₂O₃, is added in an amount of 1-15 wt%. JP 4-342,468 teaches that this ceramic composition is advantageous over prior art BN- Si₃N₄ ceramics because it provides improved corrosion resistance and improved strength (see JP 4-342,468; particularly abstract; pages 2-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the applicant's invention was made to have modified the plate material of WO 98/35775 by

the teachings of JP 4-342,468. One would have been motivated to do so in order to use a ceramic material and composition that provided improved corrosion resistance and strength, as taught by JP 4-342,468. The examiner notes that the ceramic plate material taught above reads upon the composition claimed by the applicant and would therefore have the same mechanical, thermal, and fluid properties claimed by the applicant.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the instant application is deemed to be directed to a nonobvious improvement over the invention patented in JP 07-68,354. The improvement comprises a ceramic plate for the side damn of a twin-roll strip caster that consists of 5% to 20% BN, more than 15% to 40% AlN, and 40% to 80% Si₃N₄, all percentages in mass percent.

Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. JP 03-207,554, JP 07-60,411, JP 07-68,354, JP 09-155,509, JP 01-278,944, and JP 09-51,669 are cited for illustrating the state of the art in ceramic compositions for continuous casting.
- 6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/031,317

Art Unit: 1725

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 22 August 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the claimed ceramic plate material, particularly its properties, is not taught by the references cited in the rejection. However, the references noted in rejection above teach the claimed ceramic plate, particularly a ceramic plate with an Al equivalent mass% of 9% or more. As noted in the applicant's specification on page 5, lines 24-30, such an Al equivalent is met by a ceramic composition with 15%-40% AlN. The references noted above teach 3-35 wt% AlN. Therefore, these references teach the cited ceramic plate material with an Al equivalent of 9% or more. The ceramic plate taught by these references will therefore have the same properties as the ceramic plate cited by the applicant. The references noted in the rejection also meet the cited limitations for BN content and for containing alumina, magnesia, zirconia, or yittria.

The examiner notes that claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 use broad language for the composition of the ceramic plate and does not limit the composition of the ceramic plate to the composition that is cited in these claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin L McHenry whose telephone number is (703) 305-9626. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas G Dunn can be reached on (703) 308-3318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1234.

This Moderny

Kevin McHenry

July 2